DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 210 337 UD 021 769

AUTHOR Foote, Edward T.: Bradney, Lyn
TITLE Desegregation Monitoring and Advisory Committee. Report No. 7.
INSTITUTION Saint Louis Public Schools, Mo.
PUB DATE 13 Apr 81
NOTE 92p.: For related documents, see UD 021 770-771 and UD 021 776-780.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Curriculum Development; *Desegregation Plans; Elementary Secondary Education; Enrichment Activities; Enrollment; *Magnet Schools; Management by Objectives; Needs Assessment; Program Administration; Racial Distribution; *School Demography; *School Desegregation; School Security; Special Programs; *Student Placement; Student Transportation; Teacher Transfer; Transfer Policy
IDENTIFIERS *Saint Louis City School District MO

ABSTRACT

This report updates information on the implementation of a desegregation plan in the St. Louis, Missouri, public schools. Student enrollment patterns, the revision of student and teacher assignments and transfer policies, and changes related to enrollments in special programs and magnet schools are examined. The report presents guidelines for alleviating overcrowding as well as suggestions for school facilities utilization, transportation improvement, and security measures. Also discussed are a plan to eliminate overcrowding by reassigning students to their home clusters, the problems and needs of curricular development in the middle schools, and implementation of Title I programs. Appendices include data which describe building renovations in individual schools, black and white student waiting lists in magnet schools, and letters of evaluation from Price Waterhouse and Company. (JCD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED210337

DESEGREGATION MONITORING AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Report No. 7

Submitted By

Edward T. Foote, Chairman

and

Lyn Bradney, Executive Director

April 13, 1981

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

MATTIE STANTON

ST. LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

in the cause of
Craton Liddell, et. al, Plaintiff

vs

The Board of Education of the City of
St. Louis, Missouri, et. al, Defendant

Federal District Court
Eastern District of Missouri
cause no. 72-100-C(C)

UD021769

UD021769

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	COMMITTEE ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION	
	Monitoring Activities	3
	MBO Reports	4
	Committee Membership	5
	Budget Report	5
	Donations	6
III.	STUDENT POPULATION	
	System-Wide Enrollment	6
	Integrated Schools	7
	Revisions in Student Assignments:	
	Integrated Clusters	7
	Intra-Cluster Transfers	8
	Inter-Cluster Transfers	8
	Results of Reassignments: Elementary Schools	8
	Middle Schools	9
	High Schools	9
	Magnet Recruitment: Effect on Integrated Schools	10
	Overcrowding	10
	North/South Assignments for Overcrowding	28
	Transportation Exempt Schools: Kindergarten - Eighth Grade	29
	Revisions Related to Transportation Exempt Schools	29
	Magnet Schools	30
	Revised Target Enrollments	32
	Madison Action Learning Center and English as a Second Language Students	33
	Magnet Targets: 1981-82 School Year	33
	Proposal for New Magnet High Schools	34
	Classical Academy	34
	Black Specialty Programs	35
	Student Enrollment: The Issue of Numbers	40
	Student Records	40
	Transfer Policies	
	Permissive Transfers	41
	Hardship Transfers	41
IV.	ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS	41
V.	PART-TIME INTEGRATED PROGRAMS	43
VI.	SPECIALTY PROGRAMS	43
VII.	SPECIAL EDUCATION	44
VIII.	TRANSPORTATION	50
IX.	SECURITY	52
X.	TEACHER ASSIGNMENTS	
	Certificated Staff	53
XI.	NON-CERTIFICATED STAFF	54
XII.	CURRICULAR DEVELOPMENT	
	Middle Schools	54

Elementary and High Schools 56

XIII. TITLE I 56

XIV. BUILDING RENOVATIONS 57

XV. TEXTBOOKS AND SUPPLIES 61

XVI. APPENDICES

INTRODUCTION

The end of the school year is quickly approaching. With nearly a year of monitoring behind us, we are able now to compare our recent observations of schools with earlier reports to assess the extent to which the Desegregation Plan has been implemented.

This report generally follows the format of our previous reports, except that it provides more specific comparisons and conclusions. The balance of this introduction is the briefest summary of the balance of this report.

We note that many of the early problems with transportation and security are now generally resolved. (We do still receive reports of consistently delayed buses from a few schools.) The Board has formed a committee of principals and transportation staff to handle these remaining complaints and to speed resolution of future problems.

Other than disruptions which occur during most school years, we are aware of few security problems and are heartened by the spirit of cooperation which we find consistently among school staff and students.

The Board filed its recommended revisions to the Plan on April 1, 1981. Among other recommendations, it proposed to reassign 640 students, 295 black and 345 white, to improve the racial balance at 15 integrated schools. In spite of these adjustments, the Board projects that nine of the fifteen schools affected by reassignments will still not have student populations next year which fall within the Court's guidelines for stable integration.

We note continued problems of overcrowding, particularly in the nonintegrated and middle schools. The Board plans to alleviate overcrowding at five nonintegrated schools by transferring 190 students to schools with more space. However, based on the Board's preliminary projected enrollment figures, we anticipate overcrowded schools next year, especially at middle schools and some nonintegrated high schools.

Twelve of the 15 magnet schools fall within ten percentage points of having racially balanced student populations of 50% black and 50% white. However, the Board has not admitted the full number of black

students who were eligible for admission under the 20% variance guidelines at eleven schools with openings.

The enrichment programs, initially delayed by shortages of supplies and lack of consistent guidelines, seem to be progressing well at most schools.

The implementation of special education programs remains hampered by inadequate space, insufficient equipment and supplies and missing records at some schools.

The Board has recently completed a thorough assessment of middle schools which identifies problems and needs and will use these findings to plan additional curricular developments.

Although they have taken much longer than anticipated, building renovations at the middle schools and a few magnet schools are nearing completion. Some middle school students, however, will probably not have an opportunity to work in a home economics, industrial arts or science laboratory this year.

In response to concerns about the accuracy of the Board's enrollment counts, the Chairman requested Price-Waterhouse to examine the procedures by which the Board assesses enrollment. That study satisfies us that these procedures result in a reasonably accurate enrollment count.

The Board has informed us that it plans to make all teacher assignments before the end of the school year so that teachers will have the summer to prepare adequately for next year's classes.

Two new specialty programs are proposed for next year. One would allow working parents to enroll their children in an extended day program near downtown. The other is a transportation specialty originally planned for this year. The Navy Junior ROTC program will begin next year as a magnet program for ninth and tenth graders.

COMMITTEE ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

Monitoring Activities

Since our January 19, 1981 Court report, Committee members and the League of Women Voters volunteers have again visited all schools with the exception of the five special schools not directly affected by the Desegregation Plan. We used a short questionnaire during these visits to ascertain whether:

1. schools have sufficient space for classes and offices, and the student/teacher ratio in classrooms is at or below established State guidelines;
2. enrichment programs in the nonintegrated schools are sufficiently implemented;
3. special education classes have adequate space and sufficient supplies;
4. schools have records for all of their students;
5. the communications between the principals of middle schools and the Board regarding curricular development and planning are adequate;
6. building renovations are either finished or nearing completion;
7. home economics and industrial arts classes in middle schools are fully implemented;
8. schools have full teaching staffs;
9. the principals of elementary and high schools are working on some common goals for curricular development;
10. schools are having any other persistent problems.

In the notebooks we keep for each school, we have continued to compile these completed questionnaires, along with individual reports from other sources such as parents and concerned citizens, our written inquiries to the Board regarding apparent problems, and the Board's responses to these inquiries.

We plan to administer another questionnaire to all schools prior to the semester's end and specific surveys in schools with special education classes.

With the continued assistance of Deborah Waite, President of the League of Women Voters - St. Louis Chapter, we have recruited seven new volunteers from the League of Women Voters chapters in St. Louis County to help us monitor schools. During March, we held two orientation sessions to acquaint these volunteers with the history, responsibilities and monitoring procedures of the Committee. We are fortunate to have now at least two volunteers, and, in one case, three volunteers assigned to each Committee member to assist us with our monitoring tasks. We are indebted to these volunteers for the enthusiastic help which they have generously given to us.

We are also grateful to George Wendel, Director of the Center for Urban Programs, St. Louis University, for allowing Sharon Gornstein, research associate for the Center, to work with us as a research analyst through July, 1981. Ms. Gornstein has visited several schools, administered several monitoring questionnaires, compiled information on overcrowded schools and shortages of supplies and equipment and conducted special research on the Board's magnet school enrollment policies during her first two months with us.

MBO Reports

The MBO subcommittee, chaired by Vice-Chairman Charles Brown, has continued to meet to review the management-by-objective (MBO) reports which the Board has submitted to us. To date, we have received on schedule 46 of the 70 MBO reports which we requested from the Board. We have used these reports to supplement and cross-check the information which we have gathered independently during our school visits and from individual reports.

Committee Membership

Edward T. Foote, Chairman, offered his resignation to the Court on March 27, 1981, to become effective no later than June 12, 1981, due to his appointment as President of the University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida.

Charles Brown, Vice-Chairman, offered his resignation to the Court on April 7, 1981, to take effect in mid-June of this year, because of the press of personal commitments.

Budget Report

As of April 7, 1981 the Committee had made the following expenditures:

	Expenditures To Date	Uncommitted Appropriations
Salaries	$22,169.35	$11,830.65
F.I.C.A.	1,341.55	831.45
Medical Insurance	800.02	453.98
Fringe Benefits	1,398.68	1,174.32
Regular Salaries (duplicating personnel)	130.05	69.95
Temporary Salaries	509.23	735.77
Equipment and Supplies	1,015.57	1,484.43
Printing-Publishing	1,840.08	1,659.92
Rental *	126.00	314.00
Typewriter Repair	136.25	63.75
Consultants	10,483.60	4,516.40
F.I.C.A.	31.19	62.81
Utilities	2,041.30	558.70
Postage	1,042.19	657.81
Travel	118.88	1,381.12
Transportation	1,781.56	3,218.44
Land-Building-Equipment	4,016.00	484.00
Medical Insurance	6.51	8.49
Miscellaneous	749.36	733.64
Fringe Benefits	11.39	11.61
Outstanding Expenditures	66.95	
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	$49,815.71	$30,251.24

* Effective March 1, 1981, the Committee is charged $63.00 a month for the lease of office space.

Donations

We would like to extend our grateful thanks to a number of organizations and individuals that have donated equipment and supplies or their services without compensation during the past two months. These include Barbara Floreth and Marley Smith, who donated many hours of time in helping to prepare and edit this report; Price-Waterhouse and Company, which donated equipment and supplies for a MagCard word processing unit; IBM, particularly Chuck Shields, Branch Manager, who loaned us the MagCard unit during the busy weeks before Mr. Foote filed his plan for voluntary, cooperative school desegregation; the many patient and wonderful employees at Washington University who answered telephones, took our messages, loaned us a Systems 6 word processing unit, and generally tolerated our frantic pace for the past month; and the Board for their cooperation generally and help in reproducing our many court documents.

There are many others whom we do not include for the sake of brevity but to whom we wish to convey our deepest appreciation.

These individuals and organizations have made our task immeasurably easier.

STUDENT POPULATION

System-Wide Enrollment

As of March 13, 1981, the Board reported that system-wide enrollment, including kindergarten students, totaled 60,438, of whom 78.98% are black and 21.02% are white. This represents a loss of 2,312 students since the Board's October 31, 1980 Court report. The Board has said that this decrease in enrollment is normal during any school year. During the 1979-80 school year, for example, the Board reports that it lost 2,447 students during a similar period of time. The Board attributes this loss primarily to students who have either withdrawn from schools or moved from the district since October.

Integrated Schools

The Board reports that as of March 13, 1981, 22 of the schools designated as integrated had student populations which met the Court's guidelines for stable integration, between 30-50% black. Ten did not. They are:

	Black
Dewey	(51.47%)
Hamilton	(71.79%)
Mullanphy Middle	(50.96%)
Sherman	(54.40%)
Clark	(71.96%)
Wyman	(55.84%)
Hodgen	(56.06%)
Henry	(59.63%)
Clinton Middle	(65.12%)
Banneker	(83.46%)

Student populations in two of the four high schools do not meet the Court's guidelines for integration. They are Soldan, with a student population of 62.21% black and Southwest, with a black student population of 50.12%.

McKinley High School, designated in the Order as "naturally integrated", has a racial balance of 76.76% black and 23.24% white students.

Revisions in Student Assignments:

Integrated Clusters

Under provisions of the Plan, the Board must make adjustments each spring in those schools which it projects to have student populations of less than 35% or more than 65% white. These adjustments are designed to produce the maximum number of schools with an integrated student population of 30-50% black. The Board included these adjustments in its April 1, 1981, Revisions to the Desegregation Plan report.

The Board has identified ten schools which are not projected to fall within the guidelines for maintaining integration,, between 35% and 65% white. They are Hamilton, Clark, Wyman, Hodgen, Henry and Banneker, all with projected student populations of less than 35%

white, and Garfield, Sigel, Froebel and Meramec, with projected student populations exceeding 65% white.

The six schools with projected populations of less than 35% white students represent all of the elementary schools which did not meet the Court's guidelines for stable integration (30-50% black) during the first year of implementation, with the exception of Sherman School. The Board does not anticipate that the black student population at Sherman will exceed 65% next year.

Garfield, Sigel, Froebel and Meramec have predominantly white populations of 67.93%, 65.74%, 64.04% and 64.01%, respectively.

Intra-Cluster Transfers

In order to improve the racial balance at Hamilton, Clark, Wyman, Hodgen, Garfield, and Sigel Schools, the Board plans to reassign 202 white and 230 black students to different schools within the same clusters.

Inter-Cluster Transfers

In order to bring the racial balance at Hamilton above 35% white, the Board has recommended transferring 22 white students from Mann (Fanning Cluster) to Hamilton (Dewey Cluster). In order to improve the racial balance at Banneker (Long Cluster) and at Froebel and Meramec (Clinton Cluster), the Board has recommended transferring 95 black students from Banneker to Meramec and Scruggs, and transferring 121 white students from Froebel and Meramec to Banneker. The Board has said that some transfers between the Fanning and Dewey Clusters and between the Clinton and Long clusters are necessary because the racial balance within these individual clusters does not permit it to make internal adjustments which would sufficiently meet the guidelines recommended for maintaining integration (35-65% white).

Results of Reassignments: Elementary Schools

The Board has reported that these reassignments will affect approximately 640 students, 295 black and 345 white, and will also improve the racial balance in 15 schools located in seven integrated clusters.

We observe that some students who will be affected by these adjustments will have been assigned to three different schools within a period of two years.

The Board projects that nine of the 15 schools affected by reassignments will have student populations which do not meet the Court's criteria for stable integration, between 30-50% black. These schools and their projected populations are:

	% Projected Black
Clark	61.9%
Mann	61.7%
Hamilton	61.8%
Roe	61.8%
Shenandoah	59.6%
Wyman	55.0%
Henry	51.6%
Froebel	50.7%
Meramec	52.1%

According to the Board's projections, no school should have more than 62% black students, nor less than 44% black students after reassignments.

Middle Schools

With the exception of Blow School, the integrated middle schools will not be affected by reassignments since their projected racial percentages are within Court guidelines for maintaining integration, between 35-65% white. The Board has said that although the projected enrollment for Blow is 64.4% white, some reduction in the white percentage can be achieved through assignment of special education students and the transfer of 60 black students from Columbia to alleviate overcrowding.

High Schools

The Board does not plan to alter present assignment patterns for the integrated high schools.

Magnet Recruitment:
Effect on Integrated Schools

Hamilton, Wyman and Clark Schools, with student populations exceeding 50% black, report that they have lost several white students to magnet schools since the beginning of the year. Some of these white students although assigned, to their regular schools, did not enroll at all until they were accepted later at magnet schools.

The Board recognizes the effect which magnet recruitment efforts have sometimes had on integrated schools. However, the Board has said that in order to maintain an adequate racial balance in the magnet schools, it must recruit and enroll white students from integrated, as well as nonintegrated schools, since very few whites are assigned to nonintegrated schools. The Board has also said that whenever possible, it prefers to give students the option of which school they wish to attend.

Overcrowding

We have continued to note problems of overcrowding, especially in the nonintegrated and middle schools.

Overcrowding is an ambiguous term. Its meaning may vary depending upon individual perspective. What may appear to be an overcrowded classroom to one may not to another. Therefore, we use several measures to assess overcrowding.

First, we look at the student/teacher ratio, established by the Board as guidelines for determining classroom capacity. The standard

student/teacher ratios for the different grade levels and special education classes are:

Kindergarten	25:1
Grades 1-3	26:1
Grades 4-12	30:1
EMR[1]	15:1
LD[2]	10:1
BD[3]	10:1

The Board has established these guidelines at, or below the student/teacher ratio established by the State's requirements for a Class AAA accreditation rating. The student/teacher ratio established for a AAA rating is 30:1. (State guidelines include: more than 30 students in a classroom are excessive; an individual classroom teacher may instruct more than 30 students part of the time in cooperative teaching projects, such as team teaching, but the average teaching load shall not exceed a ratio of 30:1; if an aide is assigned to the class, the individual classroom enrollment may be increased by ten; a teacher with a half-time aide may be assigned five additional students.)

These guidelines, however, are not - and should not be - rigidly applied. In the schools we monitor, sometimes the student/teacher ratio exceeds guidelines for good reason. For example, a popular class may exceed the established ratio due to high demand and interest in a course. Education does not suffer. Therefore, we look at several other subjective factors to determine whether a school is overcrowded:

1. Number of rooms used: Are all rooms used so that there is little space for flexibility, for example,

[1] EMR means a student who has been tested and diagnosed as educable mentally retarded, or as being a slow learner. Many elementary and middle schools have special classes for EMR students. At the high school level, EMR students (or slow learners) are placed in Student-Toward-Employment Program (STEP) classes. The State has established a student/teacher ratio of 20:1 for STEP classes.

[2] LD means a student who has been tested and diagnosed as having learning disabilities. Many elementary and middle schools have special classes for LD students.

[3] BD means a student who has been tested and diagnosed as having behavioral disorders. Many elementary and middle schools have special classes for BD students.

space to convene an assembly or for specialty teachers (e.g., music, art, physical education) to have their own rooms?

2. Use of portable classrooms: Is the school using "temporary" portables on a permanent basis?

3. Special education and Title I classrooms: Are special education or Title I classrooms combined to consolidate space?

4. Use of space intended for other purposes: Are the lunchroom, teachers' lounge, library, gym or auditorium used for classroom or office space?

We have compiled some of our observations of overcrowded conditions using the charts on the following pages. For purposes of comparison, however, we have used four separate charts, categorized by nonintegrated schools, integrated schools, nonintegrated middle and integrated middle schools.

The charts are divided into several columns. The first column, "Enrollment, 3/13/81", lists enrollment figures as of March 13, 1981, for each school. These totals include special education and kindergarten students. The Board provided these figures in its March 31, 1981 Court Report.

The second column, "Projected Enrollment", gives the Board's preliminary enrollment estimates for the 1981-1982 school year. The Board used these figures to assist it in determining the reassignment of "graded" (students in grades 1-12; special education students, kindergarten students, magnet, alternative and vocational school students are not designated as "graded") students for next year. The statistical projections which were provided to us by the Board are not the final total projected enrollments for each school. These figures do not include:

1. Special education students. The Board has tentative plans to relocate some special education units. (See Special Education, page 44.) These reassignments

could make the final total projected for any given school substantially different from the figures which appear in the second column.

2. The figures used for projected enrollment are straight statistical projections which reduce the November, 1980 black and white enrollments according to their different rates of attrition (e.g., the district lost twice as many whites this year as they have normally lost in other years, but lost approximately the same percentage of blacks) over a three year, system-wide average. These figures have not yet been adjusted to reflect what is happening demographically in base school areas that may be gaining or losing resident students at a different rate than system-wide averages.

   The Board is fairly confident in its projections that were used in its April 1, 1981, Revision report for Clark, Mann, Hamilton, Roe, Garfield, Hodgen, Sigel, Shenandoah, Wyman, Henry, Woodward, Banneker, Froebel, Meramec, Scruggs, Clark Branch I, Cupples, Columbia, Blow, Irving, Jackson, Lexington, Scullin, and Cote Brilliante Schools. The projections for other schools have not been adjusted yet.* Therefore, the final projected enrollment may differ from these figures. We have listed both the Board's statistical projections and enrollment projections used in the April 1, 1981 Revision report wherever applicable.

3. The projected enrollments for magnet schools are based on this year's enrollment only and do not

* The schools listed in the April 1, 1981 Revision report do not include kindergarten and special education enrollments.

represent target enrollments. Students who are new to magnet schools next year must be pulled from the enrollments of their regularly assigned schools. These adjustments have not been made.

4. The Board asked each of its four Area Superintendents to develop school level enrollment projections based upon principals' perspective and the opinion of Area staff. The Board will use these projections to adjust its own statistical projections so that the final projections reflect the unique conditions of each school.

The Board has emphasized that until all of these adjustments are made, it cannot make final total projected enrollments by school for the 1981-82 school year.

We have, therefore, used the Board's statistical projections as guideposts to determine potential overcrowding at schools next year. Recognizing that some of these figures may change substantially in the next few months, our message is one of caution and not an assessment of where overcrowding will occur next year.

The third column, "Number of Regular Classes Over (the Board's) Established Student/Teacher Ratio", lists the total number of regular classes during the first period of the day for each school. The term "regular", as used in our charts, includes all classes except specialty classes, such as vocal music, art, home economics, industrial arts, physical education, instrumental music, distributive education, study halls, in-house suspension programs, special education classrooms and classrooms used by teachers for preparatory periods. We did not include special education classes since we discuss them more fully in the section: Special Education. Nor do we include specialty classes, since they are usually meant to accommodate more students than regular classes. We have also excluded those classrooms which are used for teachers' preparatory periods. The total number of classes, then, only includes those regular classes held during the first period of

the day and does not represent the total number of classrooms in a school.

The fourth column, "Committee Observations", describes only in the briefest manner our findings and independent observations of schools. More detailed information on any one of the schools is maintained in the school notebooks which we keep in our office.

The fifth column, "Recommended Revisions by Board to Alleviate Overcrowding", provides information on the Board's recommendations in its report for proposed revisions to the Plan. Where no recommendation has been made, we have so indicated by saying "none given". We do not mean to say, however, that the Board will make no recommendations on these schools, but rather that it has made none to date.

CHART A

Overcrowding

Nonintegrated Elementary and High Schools

School	Enroll. 3/13/81[1]	Prelim. Proj. Enroll.[2]	April 1 Proj. Enroll.[3]	No. of Reg. Class.* Over Estab. Stu./Teacher Ratio	Committee Observations	Recommended Revisions By Board to Alleviate Overcrowding
Carr Lane	233	211		3 of 7 classes, ranging from a first grade class with 28 to a fifth grade class of 41.	Library partitioned for classrooms. Leased day care uses needed space.	None given
Central High	1,241	1,372		8 of 27 classes, ranging from 31-33.	Special education consolidated. Auditorium balcony used for offices. Students sit on bookcase in one class.	None given
Clark Branch I	199	197	191	3 of 7 classes, ranging from 27 in grades 1-3 to a combined fourth and fifth grade class of 32.	No space for physical education, music, art. Students eat lunch in classrooms. Need teacher aides.	Transfer 23 students from Clark Branch I to Cupples.

-16-

[1] Information provided by the Board in its March 31, 1981, Court report; includes kindergarten and special education enrollment.

[2] Information provided by the Board.

[3] The projected enrollments for some schools were provided in the Board's April 1, 1981, Revisions to the Desegregation Plan and represent more accurate enrollment figures than the preliminary statistical projections.

* "Regular", as used here, includes all classes with the exception of specialty classes, such as vocal music, art, home economics, industrial arts, physical education, instrumental music, distributive education, study halls, in-house suspension programs, special education classrooms, and classrooms used for preparatory periods.

Overcrowding
Chart A
Nonintegrated Elementary and High Schools
Page 2

School	Enroll.[1] 3/13/81	Prelim. Proj. Enroll.[2]	April 1 Proj. Enroll.[3]	No. of Reg. Class.* Over Estab. Stu./Teacher Ratio	Committee Observations	Recommended Revisions By Board to Alleviate Overcrowding
Cole	559	593		3 of 18 classes, ranging from 28 in a first grade class to a combined first and second grade class of 35.	Special education consolidated. Title I consolidated.	None given
Cote Brilliante	483	515	390	7 of 15 classes, ranging from 30 in grades 1-3 to a combined second and third grade class of 33.	Title I consolidated. No space for art and music.	Transfer 31 students from Cote Brilliante to Cupples.
Eliot	468	493		2 of 14 classes, ranging from 27-29 in grades 1-3.	Special education consolidated in auditorium. All rooms being used. No space for enrichment classes.	None given

-17-

[1] Information provided by the Board in its March 31, 1981, Court report; includes kindergarten and special education enrollment.

[2] Information provided by the Board.

[3] The projected enrollments for some schools were provided in the Board's April 1, 1981, Revisions to the Desegregation Plan and represent more accurate enrollment figures than the preliminary statistical projections.

* "Regular", as used here, includes all classes with the exception of specialty classes, such as vocal music, art, home economics, industrial arts, physical education, instrumental music, distributive education, study halls, in-house suspension programs, special education classrooms, and classrooms used for preparatory periods.

School	Enroll. 3/13/81[1]	Prelim. Proj. Enroll.[2]	April 1 Proj. Enroll.[3]	No. of Reg. Class.* Over Estab. Stu./Teacher Ratio	Committee Observations	Recommended Revisions By Board to Alleviate Overcrowding
Emerson	537	525		5 of 18 classes, ranging from 27-34 in grades 1-3.	Title I consolidated. No space for cafeteria or library.	None given
Farragut	590	537		6 of 19 classes, ranging from 27-32 in grades 1-3.	No space for enrichment classes. Using portable classrooms.	None given
Hempstead Branch	178	186		2 of 6 classes of 31-32	No space for art and music. Library in gymnasium.	None given
Herzog Branch	145	157		5 of 5 classes, ranging from 28-30 in grades 1-3.	Kindergarten is especially overcrowded. Rented church rooms not adequate space.	None given

[1] Information provided by the Board in its March 31, 1981, Court report; includes kindergarten and special education enrollment.

[2] Information provided by the Board.

[3] The projected enrollments for some schools were provided in the Board's April 1, 1981, Revisions to the Desegregation Plan and represent more accurate enrollment figures than the preliminary statistical projections.

* "Regular", as used here, includes all classes with the exception of specialty classes, such as vocal music, art, home economics, industrial arts, physical education, instrumental music, distributive education, study halls, in-house suspension programs, special education classrooms, and classrooms used for preparatory periods.

Overcrowding
Chart A
Nonintegrated Elementary and High Schools
Page 4

School	Enroll.[1] 3/13/81	Prelim. Proj. Enroll.[2]	April 1 Proj. Enroll.[3]	No. of Reg. Class.* Over Estab. Stu./Teacher Ratio	Committee Observations	Recommended Revisions By Board to Alleviate Overcrowding
Lexington	495	454	390	10 of 15 classes, ranging from 27 in grades 1-3 to a fourth grade class of 34.	All rooms being used. No space for art and music. No gymnasium or auditorium.	Transfer 50 students from Lexington to Scullin.
Mark Twain	435	418		4 of 10 classes, ranging from 27 in grades 1-3 to a fifth grade class of 35.	All rooms being used. Auditorium used for classes. One-half aide for fifth grade.	None given
Mark Twain Branch	238	219		5 of 9 classes, ranging from 27-30 in grades 1-3.	One room used for library, art, music, and physical education. Title I consolidated with two other classes.	None given

[1] Information provided by the Board in its March 31, 1981, Court report; includes kindergarten and special education enrollment.

[2] Information provided by the Board.

[3] The projected enrollments for some schools were provided in the Board's April 1, 1981, Revisions to the Desegregation Plan and represent more accurate enrollment figures than the preliminary statistical projections.

* "Regular", as used here, includes all classes with the exception of specialty classes, such as vocal music, art, home economics, industrial arts, physical education, instrumental music, distributive education, study halls, in-house suspension programs, special education classrooms, and classrooms used for preparatory periods.

Overcrowding
Chart A
Nonintegrated Elementary and High Schools
Page 5

School	Enroll.[1] 3/13/81	Prelim. Proj. Enroll.[2]	April 1 Proj. Enroll.[3]	No. of Reg. Class.* Over Estab. Stu./Teacher Ratio	Committee Observations	Recommended Revisions By Board to Alleviate Overcrowding
Northwest High	1,611	1,444		14 of 14 classes, ranging from 31-42.	All rooms being used. Special education consolidated. Title I shares with home economics. Enrichment program in the old evaluation office. Two full-time and one part-time counselor share office. Tutorial classes in cafeteria. Using isolated area of auditorium for classroom. Library used for small afternoon class.	None given
Summer High	1,765	1,706		15 of 45 classes, ranging from 31-35.	All rooms being used.	None given
Walnut Park	587	573		10 of 18 classes, ranging from 27-30 in grades 1-3.	All rooms being used. Title I consolidated in basement. No space for art, music, physical education, and library.	None given

[1] Information provided by the Board in its March 31, 1981, Court report; includes kindergarten and special education enrollment.

[2] Information provided by the Board.

[3] The projected enrollments for some schools were provided in the Board's April 1, 1981, Revisions to the Desegregation Plan and represent more accurate enrollment figures than the preliminary statistical projections.

* "Regular", as used here, includes all classes with the exception of specialty classes, such as vocal music, art, home economics, industrial arts, physical education, instrumental music, distributive education, study halls, in-house suspension programs, special education classrooms, and classrooms used for preparatory periods.

Overcrowding
Chart A
Nonintegrated Elementary and High Schools
Page 6

School	Enroll.[1] 3/13/81	Prelim. Proj. Enroll.[2]	April 1 Proj. Enroll.[3]	No. of Reg. Class.* Over Estab. Stu./Teacher Ratio	Committee Observations	Recommended Revisions By Board to Alleviate Overcrowding
Walnut Park Branch	209	185		2 of 7 classes, ranging from 30 in grades 1-3 to a fourth grade class of 32.	No space for music and art. Title I and physical education share auditorium.	None given

-21-

[1] Information provided by the Board in its March 31, 1981, Court report; includes kindergarten and special education enrollment.

[2] Information provided by the Board.

[3] The projected enrollments for some schools were provided in the Board's April 1, 1981, Revisions to the Desegregation Plan and represent more accurate enrollment figures than the preliminary statistical projections.

* "Regular", as used here, includes all classes with the exception of specialty classes, such as vocal music, art, home economics, industrial arts, physical education, instrumental music, distributive education, study halls, in-house suspension programs, special education classrooms, and classrooms used for preparatory periods.

CHART B

Overcrowding

Integrated Elementary and High Schools

School	Enroll. 3/13/81 [1]	Prelim. Proj. Enroll. [2]	April 1 Proj. Enroll. [3]	No. of Reg. Class.* Over Estab. Stu./Teacher Ratio	Committee Observations	Recommended Revisions By Board to Alleviate Overcrowding
Banneker	393	357	302	7 of 12 classes, ranging from 27 in grades 1-3 to a fourth grade class of 35.	All rooms being used. One half-time aide for overcrowded classrooms.	None given
Oak Hill	345	318		5 of 12 classes, ranging from 27-30 in grades 1-3.	No space for music. Library in basement.	None given

-22-

[1] Information provided by the Board in its March 31, 1981, Court report; includes kindergarten and special education enrollment.

[2] Information provided by the Board.

[3] The projected enrollments for some schools were provided in the Board's April 1, 1981, Revisions to the Desegregation Plan and represent more accurate enrollment figures than the preliminary statistical projections.

* "Regular", as used here, includes all classes with the exception of specialty classes, such as vocal music, art, home economics, industrial arts, physical education, instrumental music, distributive education, study halls, in-house suspension programs, special education classrooms, and classrooms used for preparatory periods.

CHART C

Overcrowding

Nonintegrated Middle Schools

School	Enroll.[1] 3/13/81	Prelim. Proj. Enroll.[2]	April 1 Proj. Enroll.[3]	No. of Reg. Class.* Over Estab. Stu./Teacher Ratio	Committee Observations	Recommended Revisions By Board to Alleviate Overcrowding
Cook	455	501		10 of 15 classes, ranging from 31-36.	No space for extracurricular classes. Special education consolidated.	None given
Columbia	551	561	447	14 of 14 classes, ranging from 33-36.	Special education consolidated with 38 students in two rooms. Enrichment program does not have own room. Speech held in teachers lounge. Instrumental music held in lunchroom.	Transfer 60 students from Columbia to Blow
Ford	579	596		10 of 16 classes, ranging from 31-36	Special education consolidated. Held in one-half former kindergarten classroom. No space for library. No space for art and music.	None given

[1] Information provided by the Board in its March 31, 1981, Court report; includes kindergarten and special education enrollment.

[2] Information provided by the Board.

[3] The projected enrollments for some schools were provided in the Board's April 1, 1981, Revisions to the Desegregation Plan and represent more accurate enrollment figures than the preliminary statistical projections.

* "Regular", as used here, includes all classes with the exception of specialty classes, such as vocal music, art, home economics, industrial arts, physical education, instrumental music, distributive education, study halls, in-house suspension programs, special education classrooms, and classrooms used for preparatory periods.

Overcrowding
Chart C
Nonintegrated Middle Schools
Page 2

School	Enroll.[1] 3/13/81	Prelim. Proj. Enroll.[2]	April 1 Proj. Enroll.[3]	No. of Reg. Class.* Over Estab. Stu./Teacher Ratio	Committee Observations	Recommended Revisions By Board to Alleviate Overcrowding
Hickey	431	384		2 of 13 classes, both which have 31.	8 classes held in converted closets. Special education consolidated.	None given
King	512	525		5 of 12 classes, all which have 31.	All rooms being used. Office shared by nurse, Title I, counselor, and asistant principal. Same room used for art and music.	None given
Simmons	602	560		8 of 13 classes, ranging from 31-33.	All rooms being used. Social worker, speech teacher, and counselor share office space.	None given

[1] Information provided by the Board in its March 31, 1981, Court report; includes kindergarten and special education enrollment.

[2] Information provided by the Board.

[3] The projected enrollments for some schools were provided in the Board's April 1, 1981, Revisions to the Desegregation Plan and represent more accurate enrollment figures than the preliminary statistical projections.

* "Regular", as used here, includes all classes with the exception of specialty classes, such as vocal music, art, home economics, industrial arts, physical education, instrumental music, distributive education, study halls, in-house suspension programs, special education classrooms, and classrooms used for preparatory periods.

Overcrowding
Chart C
Nonintegrated Middle Schools
Page 3

School	Enroll.[1] 3/13/81	Prelim. Proj. Enroll.[2]	April 1 Proj. Enroll.[3]	No. of Reg. Class.* Over Estab. Stu./Teacher Ratio	Committee Observations	Recommended Revisions By Board to Alleviate Overcrowding
Washington	478	472		8 of 12 classes ranging from 31-35.	All rooms being used.	None given
Williams	575	553		10 of 23 classes, ranging from 31-35.	No space for music and art. Instrumental music in lunchroom, no vocal music. All rooms being used. Title I classes held in nurse's office, principal's office and hallway.	None given

[1] Information provided by the board in its March 31, 1981, Court report; includes kindergarten and special education enrollment.

[2] Information provided by the Board.

[3] The projected enrollments for some schools were provided in the Board's April 1, 1981, Revisions to the Desegregation Plan and represent more accurate enrollment figures than the preliminary statistical projections.

* "Regular", as used here, includes all classes with the exception of specialty classes, such as vocal music, art, home economics, industrial arts, physical education, instrumental music, distributive education, study halls, in-house suspension programs, special education classrooms, and classrooms used for preparatory periods.

CHART D

Overcrowding

Integrated Middle Schools

School	Enroll. 3/13/81[1]	Prelim. Proj. Enroll.[2]	April 1 Proj. Enroll.[3]	No. of Reg. Class.* Over Estab. Stu./Teacher Ratio	Committee Observations	Recommended Revisions By Board to Alleviate Overcrowding
Blo	442	378	434	2 of 16 classes, ranging from 31-36.	Teacher's lounge used for several classes. All rooms being used. Special education in counselor's office.	Transfer 60 students from Columbia to Blow
Clinton	448	411		7 of 13 classes, ranging from 31-36.	Special education consolidated. All rooms being used.	None given
Grant	460	397		3 of 10 classes, with 31 students in each.	Special education consolidated. Two full-time teachers do not have designated classrooms.	None given
Long	499	431		3 of 15 classes, ranging from 31-33.	Special education consolidated and held in former gymnasium.	Transfer 40 students from Long to Yeatman

[1] Information provided by the Board in its March 31, 1981, Court report; includes kindergarten and special education enrollment.

[2] Information provided by the Board.

[3] The projected enrollments for some schools were provided in the Board's April 1, 1981, Revisions to the Desegregation Plan and represent more accurate enrollment figures than the preliminary statistical projections.

* "Regular", as used here, includes all classes with the exception of specialty classes, such as vocal music, art, home economics, industrial arts, physical education, instrumental music, distributive education, study halls, in-house suspension programs, special education classrooms, and classrooms used for preparatory periods.

Overcrowding
Chart D
Integrated Middle Schools
Page 2

School	Enroll.[1] 3/13/81	Prelim. Proj. Enroll.[2]	April 1 Proj. Enroll.[3]	No. of Reg. Class.* Over Estab. Stu./Teacher Ratio	Committee Observations	Recommended Revisions By Board to Alleviate Overcrowding
L'Ouverture	555	497		4 of 12 classes, ranging from 31-36.	Special education consolidated.	None given
Nottingham	207	178		4 of 5 classes, ranging from 33-35.	Title I and Sight Conservation share room. Special education consolidated.	Transfer 6 students from Nottingham to Stowe

-27-

[1] Information provided by the Board in its March 31, 1981, Court report; includes kindergarten and special education enrollment.

[2] Information provided by the Board.

[3] The projected enrollments for some schools were provided in the Board's April 1, 1981, Revisions to the Desegregation Plan and represent more accurate enrollment figures than the preliminary statistical projections.

* "Regular", as used here, includes all classes with the exception of specialty classes, such as vocal music, art, home economics, industrial arts, physical education, instrumental music, distributive education, study halls, in-house suspension programs, special education classrooms, and classrooms used for preparatory periods.

Based strictly on the Board's preliminary estimates of enrollment for next year, we anticipate some continued problems with overcrowding. Thirteen of the 33 schools in which we cite overcrowded conditions have projected enrollments (rough as they are) which are relatively the same (within 20 students) or higher than current enrollment.

The Board's projected figures do not include kindergarten and special education enrollments, and, therefore, final projections may increase or decrease depending upon assignments of these students. Even though the projected enrollment for Northwest is 167 below current enrollment, we note that there are 84 special education students currently enrolled at Northwest. We have also learned that at Northwest, while less than 200 students are graduating, the freshman class is projected to have 732 students.

We also note some problems with the transfer of 60 black students from Columbia to Blow. Two of the 16 regular classes during the first period at Blow exceed the Board's established student/teacher ratio, one with 31 students and one with 36 students. We have observed that the BD class is in a counselor's office and the teachers' lounge is presently shared by a resource, Title I and Remedial Reading class.

North/South Assignments for Overcrowding

Approximately 900 black students are transported from northside schools to integrated schools on the southside to alleviate overcrowding. The Court Order requires the Board in its April 1, 1981, proposed Revisions to the Desegregation Plan to examine all north-to-south "overcrowded" student assignments to determine whether any of these assignments can be discontinued. The Board reports that only 83 of the approximately 900 students currently transported for overcrowding can be reassigned to their home school next year because there will be no room.

Under the Plan, students transported from overcrowded, nonintegrated schools, to integrated schools with available space were given a one-

time option to return to their home school attendance area for assignment. Because only 13 students selected this option, and because of the lack of space in the home schools, the Board has recommended that the return option not be extended for the 1981-82 school year.

Transportation Exempt Schools: Kindergarten - Eighth Grade

In our report of January 19, 1981, we noted problems associated with the lack of home economics and industrial arts programs and science laboratories at the three schools which remained kindergarten-eighth grade schools under the Plan: Adams, Clay and Peabody. Most teachers and administrators whom we interviewed said that the lack of these programs might later pose problems for their students when they entered high school. They would be two years behind in their studies of practical art and applied sciences.

The Board responded to this situation at their March 10, 1981 meeting by approving funds for establishing a middle school component at Clay and Peabody Schools. The Board did not appropriate similar funds for Adams School since it is unsure how long Adams will remain open.

Revisions Related to Transportation Exempt Schools

Under provisions of the Plan, any school which has a residential student population which has been between 25 and 60 percent black for at least two years and is not changing racial composition more than 10 percent a year should be exempted from any busing of its resident students so long as it remains witnin this range. The Board has identified two such base school areas, Ames and Sherman.

Students living in the Ames and Sherman base school attendance areas will be exempted from transportation next year. Two base school

attendance areas, Adams and Clay, were previously exempted by the Court.

Students who live in the Ames attendance area who are not admitted to Ames Center for Expressive and Receptive Arts will be assigned to Clay since it is within walking distance for most of these students.

Students living in the Sherman area will be assigned to Sherman School for kindergarten - fifth grades and to Mullanphy for grades 6-8, since both schools are within walking distance for most of the students.

Magnet Schools

As of April 6, 1981, the Board reported that 12 of the 15 magnet schools are below their target enrollment.* These schools are:

Academic and Athletic Academy
Academy of Math and Science
Ames Center for Expressive and Receptive Arts
Center for Business, Management and Finance
Classical Junior Academy
Health Careers High School
Madison Action Learning
Montessori
Visual and Performing Arts High School
Wade Individually Guided Education
Waring Academy of Basic Instruction
Wilkinson Foreign Language Experience

The Board reports that the openings at some of these schools will not be filled.

The Board cut off enrollment at magnet high schools as of February 13, 1981, except for students transferring from outside of the district; these enrollments were cut off after March 27, 1981, when the fourth quarter began.

The Board continued to fill openings at magnet elementary schools through March 27, 1981. No enrollments have been made since then except of "English as a Second Language" students at Madison Action Learning Center.

* The revised target enrollment and not the original target in the Plan. (See Chart G on page 38.)

In all, two magnet elementary schools exceed their target enrollment* as of April 6, 1981:

Visual and Performing Arts Center
Stix Investigative Learning Center

Six magnet schools are within 13 students of reaching their target enrollment* in the regular grades:

Academic and Athletic Academy
Ames Center for Expressive and Receptive Arts
Health Careers High School
Montessori
Waring Academy of Basic Instruction
Wilkinson Foreign Language Experience

Twelve of the fifteen magnet schools fall within ten percentage points of having racially balanced populations of 50% white and 50% black students. Of these twelve, white students outnumber black students only at the Classical Junior Academy. Three magnet schools have black student enrollment exceeding 60%:

Math and Science Academy - 61.5%
Montessori - 61.9%
Waring Academy of Basic Instruction - 65.93%

None of the schools exceed the allowable variance of no more than 70% of any race. Some have spaces available, even though black students remain on the waiting list.

Under provisions for magnet school enrollment in the Plan, the Board is to enroll students on a 50% white, 50% black basis. The Plan states that "while the goal shall be to achieve a 50% black/50% white racial balance in each magnet school it is recognized that such a goal cannot always be achieved, ... a 20% variance could be used under appropriate circumstances".

The Board has said that at the beginning of the second semester, it attempted to enroll 158 black students from the waiting list into magnet high schools. (As explained below, however, the "waiting list" is ambiguous.) It was only able to successfully enroll 34 students because the remainder did not want to transfer from their regular high schools. These 34 students admitted into magnet high schools at

* The revised target enrollment and not the original target in the Plan. (See Chart G on page 38.)

the beginning of the second semester have been the only black students admitted under the variance since our January 19, 1981 Court report.

The final number of black students admitted to magnet high schools under the 20% variance this school year is 165 and is shown on Chart E, by school, in the third column, "Total Admitted Under Variance During School Year". (See page 36.) The total number of black students admitted to magnet elementary schools under the variance this school year is 221 and is shown on Chart F, by school, also in the third column. (See page 37.)

The fourth column of both charts shows the number of students on the waiting list after the Board stopped admitting black students under the 20% variance. The actual unduplicated number of students on waiting lists, however, is lower than these charts indicate, since students who applied for enrollment in magnet schools were asked to list their top three choices and would therefore appear on the waiting list of each school which they had listed. Nevertheless, for the purposes of these charts, we have assumed that each student on a magnet school waiting list qualifies to fill the available openings.

In determining the number of places at magnet schools that were not filled, we defined "opening" as any space which was open below the target enrollment of a school with a waiting list. In Chart E, we have used enrollment as of February 12, 1981, for the magnet high schools because this is the date after which enrollment was cut off. In Chart F for magnet elementary schools, we have used enrollment as of April 6, 1981, the most recent date for which we were provided enrollment figures. We took the grade level of applicants into consideration when determining openings since openings are categorized by grade level at elementary schools, and by grade and race, at the first and ninth grade level. (At all other grade levels, the Board looks at only the overall racial balance of the school before determining eligibility.)

Revised Target Enrollments

Since the adoption of the magnet school target enrollment figures used in the Plan, the Board has revised magnet school target enrollments. The target enrollment figures referred to throughout this section

the revised figures, provided by the Board. The Board has given reasons for these changes: (1) that the capacity of the building either would not accommodate the original target enrollment or could accommodate more; (2) that the interest shown was not as great as anticipated, so the Board decided to staff the school to reflect the reduced interest shown; (3) that the magnet program was new and would be restricted in its first year to only certain grade levels (as was the case at the Health Careers High School); and (4) that federal funds were not available to fund the target outlined in the Plan.

Chart G contains a comparison of the original target enrollments and the enrollments adopted in August, 1980, which were used during the school year to determine admission into magnet schools.

Madison Action Learning Center and English as a Second Language Students

Madison Action Learning Center is a magnet program designed to use the city as a classroom by providing field experiences for students to make them aware of careers open to them. The Center currently has a long waiting list but cannot accommodate more students because the Board placed English as a Second Language (ESL) students there. ESL students receive additional English instruction at Madison. The Board decided to place ESL students at Madison because the transportation routes for magnets accommodated ESL students, since they are scattered across the city, as are magnet school students.

The two classrooms which have been set aside for ESL students have reduced the available space for other students who wish to attend Madison.

Magnet Targets: 1981-82 School Year

The Board has proposed changes in target enrollments at magnet schools for the 1981-82 school year. These changes are outlined in Chart H. (See page 39.)

The Board proposes to raise the targets at seven magnet schools. At all of these but the Visual and Performing Arts High, the Board has determined that the high degree of interest expressed in the programs

warrants expanding the enrollment. The current waiting list at these seven schools ranges from 246 to 1,066.

The Board does not propose to raise the target enrollment at the Center for Business, Management and Finance, where the current waiting list is 200, Ames Center for Expressive and Receptive Arts, where the current waiting list is 461, and Montessori, where the current waiting list is 389. The Board has said that this is because space is not available in these schools to accommodate additional students. The Board has said that it hopes the situation will change by the 1982-83 school year at the Center for Business, Management and Finance where available space will increase when building renovations are completed.

The Board proposes to lower the target enrollment at two magnet schools: the Classical Junior Academy, which was not able to recruit its target enrollment during the 1980-81 school year, and Wilkinson Foreign Language Experience School, which the Board says does not have the building capacity for the original target. The current waiting list at Wilkinson is 246.

Proposal for New Magnet High Schools

The Board has proposed establishing a new magnet Navy Junior ROTC Academy program for high school students next year. As envisioned by the Board, the Academy will provide a regular high school curriculum as well as a military component with naval science courses in navigation, oceanography and meteorology. It will also include leadership training and an extensive physical fitness program.

In its first year of implementation, the program will be restricted to freshmen and sophomores and have a target enrollment of 200. The program will be expanded by one grade in each of the subsequent two years until it reaches a final target enrollment of 400.

Classical Academy

In our report of November 18, 1980, we observed that the Classical Academy seemed to exist in name only because it had no separate, specialized classes for Classical Academy students. At the beginning of the second semester, the Board implemented ten specialized,

distinct classes for freshmen and sophomores enrolled in the Classical Academy. During a recent visit to the school, we learned that some Classical Academy students may participate in as few as one of these specialized classes during a semester. We had assumed that Classical Academy students would primarily take the ten specialized classes which were implemented. The Board has said that the number of Classical Academy courses which a student takes will vary, depending upon the student's particular interests and scheduling conflicts.

We also note that there was a lack of second semester recruitment efforts for the Classical Academy at all high schools except Soldan. Prior to the beginning of the second semester, the Board had said that recruitment efforts were restricted to Soldan because the results of the California Achievement Test (CAT), used as a determinant for eligibility, had not been compiled for all schools. Once the scores were assessed, the Board said it hoped to recruit students from other high schools for the second semester. As of April 2, 1981, the Board said that students who had scored in the 85th percentile on the CAT this year would be scheduled for further testing for next year. It is too late to admit any more students this year.

Black Specialty Programs

In our reports of November 18, 1980, and January 19, 1981, we had recommended that the Board should consider creation of additional specialized programs for black students who, due to their race and federal funding provisions, cannot be accommodated in a magnet school.

We understand that the possibility of voluntary, interdistrict exchanges next year may open up new options for those black students who wish to attend schools in other districts. However, the problem of extensive waiting lists may still remain for those black students who want to attend a city magnet school rather than a school in another district. Therefore, in light of the many black students who cannot be accommodated in magnets this year and the possibility that the same situation may exist again next year, we strongly recommend that the Board continue to explore the possibility of establishing additional specialty programs, regardless of racial compositions of the student body attracted.

CHART E

Magnet High Schools:

Students Admintted Under Variance

Name of School	Enrollment as of 4-6-81 / 2-12-81[1]	% Black as of 4-6-81 / 2-12-81	Total Admitted Under Variance During School Yr.	Waiting List[2] as of 2-14/81 White	Black	No. of Elig. Blk. Stu. Not Admit. Under[3] 20% Variance
Center for Business, Mgt. and Finance	224 / 236	57.59% / 55.08%	60	0	163	24
Academy of Math and Science	338 / 348	61.54% / 59.48%	38	0	289	12
Visual and Performing Arts High School	548 / 553	53.65% / 52.99%	54	17	277	27
Health Careers High School	93 / 99	52.69% / 56.56%	16	0	9	1

-36-

[1] After this date, enrollment of all but transfer students was cut off; therefore, no additional variance students were admitted.

[2] February 14, 1981 is the closest date after enrollment was cut off for which the Board could provide us a waiting list. The complete waiting list by grade level may be found in Appendix A.

[3] As of February 12, 1981, after which enrollment was cut off.

CHART F

Magnet Elementary Schools:

Students Admitted Under Variance

Name of School	Enrollment as of 4-6-81[1]	% Black as of 4-6-81[1]	Total Admitted Under Variance During School Yr.	Waiting List as of 4-6-81[2] White	Waiting List as of 4-6-81[2] Black	No. of Elig. Blk. Stu. Not Admit. Under 20% Variance[3]
Academic and Athletic Academy	150	52.67%	45	0	87	10
Ames	396	59.09%	46	0	461	4
Classical Junior Academy	442	49.55%	0	0	0	None
Montessori	189	61.90%	38	0	124	1
Madison Action Learning	333	51.05%	0	1	385	None[4]
Visual and Performing Arts Center	485	54.23%	14	21	851	None
Stix	426	56.81%	26	8	1058	None
Mallinckrodt	325	50.15%	0	6	375	None
Waring	317	65.93%	0	0	558	13
Wade	378	57.14%	22	11	749	10
Wilkinson	218	50.00%	30	4	242	7

[1] Does not include Kindergarten except at Montessori, where Kindergarten students are included in determining racial balance.

[2] Does not include Kindergarten except, again, at Montessori. A complete waiting list by grade level may be found in Appendix A.

[3] As of April 6, 1981.

[4] Although Madison is below its target enrollment by 3 students, the Board said it is reserving these spaces for "English as a Second Language" students.

CHART G

Target Enrollment

Name of School	Original Target	Revised Target
Business, Management and Finance	500	260
Math and Science	350	360
Visual & Performing Arts High School	500	580
Health Careers	200	100
Academic and Athletic Academy	200	160
Ames	425 *	425 *
Classical Junior Academy	600	600
Montessori	250 *	190 *
Madison	325 *	375 *
Visual and Performing Arts Center	425 *	500 *
Stix	400 *	425 *
Mallinckrodt	650 *	325 680
Waring		355*
Wade	400 *	415 *
Wilkinson	325 *	250 *

* Includes kindergarten

CHART H

Magnet Targets:

1981-82 School Year

School	From[1]	To[1]	Reason for Change[2]
Center for Business, Management and Finance	500	350	B
Academy of Math and Science	350	400	B
Visual and Performing Arts High School	500	600	A
Classical Junior Academy	600	500	B
Madison Action Learning Center	325	400	B
Visual & Performing Arts Center	425	475	B
Stix Investigative Learning Center	400	450	B
Academy of Basic Instruction			
Mallinckrodt	650	325	B
Waring		375	
Wade Individually Guided Education	400	425	B
Wilkinson Foreign Language Experience	325	250	A

[1] Target enrollments include kindergarten enrollment.

[2] Reason for change: A - Capacity of building
B - Estimate of interest adjusted

Student Enrollment: The Issue of Numbers

In response to concerns expressed by some Committee members and at least one party in this case, the Chairman requested Price-Waterhouse to examine the procedures by which the Board assesses enrollment and updates its enrollment files.

Attached in Appendix B are two letters, submitted on March 4 and March 19, 1981, by Price-Waterhouse which generally:

1. describe the review and performance procedures undertaken by Price-Waterhouse to assess the adequacy of the Board's procedures for maintaining and updating its enrollment data (March 4, 1981);
2. express a formal opinion as to the adequacy of the Board's procedures (March 4, 1981);
3. outline the steps that would be required to perform a full audit of the Board's enrollment counts (March 19, 1981).

Based on Price-Waterhouse's opinion, we are satisfied with the relative accuracy of the Board's enrollment counts as provided by these procedures. A more detailed and complete analysis of the Board's enrollment procedures could be performed, as described in Price-Waterhouse's letter of March 19, 1981 (see Appendix B). The cost of such an audit, as estimated by Price-Waterhouse, would be in the range of $16,000 to $20,000. We do not believe such an additional expenditure is necessary.

Student Records

During our most recent monitoring visits, we learned that 32 schools are still missing some of their students' records. In some cases, schools were missing the records of students who had only transferred recently. We attempted to differentiate between these

situations in which some delay in receiving the appropriate records might be expected and those situations where delays had persisted throughout most of the year.

Three schools, Cleveland, Langston, and Yeatman, reported that they were missing 30 or more records. We learned that Cleveland was lacking over 100 records.

The Board is aware of this problem and has said that many records are missing due to:

1. the massive number of transfer students this year and subsequent delays in transferring all records to new schools;
2. the closings of 27 schools and subsequent delays in transferring records to new schools;
3. the relocation of the Special Education offices and delays in transferring duplicate special education records to a new facility.

Transfer Policies

Permissive Transfers

The Board has recommended that permissive transfers be automatically renewed from year to year except when a student's assignment changes due to entering middle school or high school.

Hardship Transfers

The Board has recommended that hardship transfers be automatically renewed from year to year except when a student's assignment changes due to entering middle school or high school, or when the permit's expiration date is reached.

ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS

In two earlier reports of November 18, 1980, and January 19, 1981, we observed several problems with the implementation of enrichment programs, including lack of consistent guidelines, insufficient

textbooks and supplies and limited participation of students in some schools. However, we have now received reports from nearly all of the nonintegrated schools which indicate that the enrichment labs are fully implemented, and in most cases, progressing well. Several teachers told us that the area facilitators were helpful in developing individual guidelines for their program.

We did observe that there was inadequate space in seven schools for enrichment labs to be held in separate rooms. However, teachers had improvised in these situations by visiting the regular classrooms or using the library to conduct classes.

At least eleven schools reported that they were still lacking some equipment and supplies, but most teachers said that this was due to placing orders late. One school had just received its budget for supplies; therefore, the teachers had not had the opportunity to purchase all of the needed texts and supplies. One principal said that he had not bought supplies because he had assumed that schools would first be provided with guidelines which specified required texts.

We observed that, with the exception of approximately eight schools, all students in the nonintegrated schools participated in enrichment programs. Schools that had limited participation are: Mark Twain, Mark Twain Branch, Turner, Williams, Northwest, Central, McKinley and Beaumont. However, in approximately seven of the schools with a higher enrollment, enrichment labs were held less than twice a week, as directed by the Plan. Many of the teachers whom we interviewed in those schools said that two sessions a week was unrealistic since they must provide instruction for all students in the school. These teachers recommended limiting sessions to once a week.

PART-TIME INTEGRATED PROGRAMS

The Board has recommended implementation of more part-time integrated programs for next year using additional cultural institutions, Shaw's Garden, the Missouri Historical Society, the Museum of Science and Natural History, the Planetarium, the St. Louis Zoo, the United Nations Association, the St. Louis Symphony, Springboard to Learning, Channel 9 (educational television) KETC, and Law/Consumer Education to promote further integrated experiences for students attending integrated and nonintegrated schools.

SPECIALTY PROGRAMS

The Board has proposed an Extended Day Program for both Wyman and Henry Schools. These programs would offer enrichment and recreational activities for students enrolled in the schools on an extended day basis. The Board hopes that by providing a specialty program at these two schools, the schools may be able to maintain an integrated racial balance next year. Henry and Wyman had student populations which did not fall within Court guidelines for integration this year. Even with the proposed reassignment of black students from Woodward to Henry, and from Shenandoah to Wyman, these two schools are still projected to have populations exceeding 50% black, and therefore, would not meet the Court's criteria for integration.

The Board does not plan to recruit students for this program on a 50% black, 50% white basis. However, the Board would accept only those students who qualified for enrollment under the conditions approved for permissive transfers. That is, students assigned to a regular school where they are in the racial majority may transfer to a school where they would be in the minority. The Board has said that the Extended Day Program would not be discontinued during its first year of implementation if no white students enrolled.

The Board also plans to implement a specialty program in transportation for high school students next year. This particular program

was originally planned to begin this year but due to lack of funding, was cancelled. The Board plans to recruit 100 students for this program on a matching basis of 50% black and 50% white.

Six other programs - Mass Media at Shaw, Mass Media at McKinley, Public Safety, Honors Art, Honors Music and the Classical Academy - will continue as specialty programs but will have decreased enrollments due to the lack of student interest shown in them this year.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

We have received from several schools reports of continued problems affecting the implementation of special education classes. These problems include:

1. lack of adequate space, requiring principals to combine classes in one room or use temporary quarters, such as the library, cafeteria or teachers' lounge to accommodate students;
2. insufficient supplies, equipment and testing materials;
3. missing records, including the Individual Educational Program Plans (IEPs), which provide a record of the student's ability level and academic progress to date.

We have documented some of our observations of these problems in the charts on the following pages. More detailed information on each school is kept in the individual school notebooks.

CHART I

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Elementary Schools

School	Space Provision/ Condition of Rooms	Textbooks & Supplies	Records
Adams	Two EMR classes share one room with no partition.	Sufficient	One missing
Bryan Hill	BD class partitioned in basement.	Sufficient	One missing
Cole	BD and EMR share partitioned class in basement.	Sufficient	None missing
Dunbar	Two LD classes share partitioned room.	Sufficient	None missing
Eliot	EMR class shares partitioned room with kindergarten.	Sufficient	None missing
Field	Sufficient	Sufficient	Two or three missing
Hempstead	Sufficient	Sufficient	All IEP's missing Twenty-five S2's missing
Hodgen	Separate portable classrooms for all classes.	No books for primary	None missing
Irving	Sufficient	Sufficient	One IEP missing
Jefferson	LD class shares partitioned from with Resource class.	Sufficient	None missing
Laclede	Sufficient	Sufficient	Some missing. One classroom burned, all records destroyed.

Special Education
Chart I - Elementary Schools
Page 2

School	Space Provision/ Condition of Rooms	Textbooks & Supplies	Records
Scruggs	Sufficient	Getting text booklets a problem. No text books or supplies all year.	None missing
Shepard	EMR classes share partitioned rooms.	Sufficient	None missing

CHART J

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Middle Schools

School	Space Provision/ Condition of Rooms	Textbooks & Supplies	Records
Blow	Resource teacher shares room with Title I and Remedial Reading classes. BD class uses Counselor's office.	Sufficient	None missing
Clinton	Two EMR classes share partitioned room. Two LD classes share partitioned room.	Sufficient	None missing
Columbia	Four special education classes in two rooms with 19 in each room.	Sufficient	None missing
Cook	Two EMR classes share room with no partition.	Sufficient	None missing
Dewey	Two LD classes share room with no partition.	Sufficient	None missing
Fanning	BD class in small room in basement.	Sufficient	None missing
Ford	Two BD classes share room with no partition. Two EMR classes share room with no partition.	Sufficient	None missing
Grant	Two EMR classes share a partitioned room. One EMR class shares partitioned room with counselor. Two LD classes share partitioned room.	Sufficient	Seven missing
Hickey	Two LD and one BD class share partitioned room.	Sufficient	None missing

School	Space Provision/ Condition of Rooms	Textbooks & Supplies	Records
King	Sufficient	Sufficient	Unspecified number missing
Langston	Two EMR classes share room with no partition. Two LD classes share room with no partition.	Insufficient textbooks	Nine missing
Long	One LD and one BD class share common area in former gym. Sixth grade at other end with no partition.	Sufficient	None missing
L'Ouverture	Two EMR classes share room with no partition.	Sufficient	None missing
Stevens	Six classes share three partitioned classrooms.	Sufficient	Some missing
Stowe	Two EMR classes share partitioned room.	Sufficient	None missing
Washington	Two LD classes share a partitioned room.	Insufficient LD textbooks	Two missing
Webster	Two LD classes share room with no partition.	Some Readers insufficient	Some IEP's missing

The Board has said that it has reviewed all special classroom locations for the purposes of alleviating overcrowding and reducing the transportation burden for special education students. The Board did not include changes in the location of special education classes in the proposed Plan revisions, but has said that wherever possible, it has reassigned students to their home cluster, or the nearest cluster next to their home cluster. This required the Board to:

1. identify all students by type of special education service (i.e., BD, LD and EMR), by level (i.e., elementary and middle) and count them by their base school attendance area; that is, their area of residence;
2. identify current special education classrooms by type and level within each cluster;
3. assign all students to appropriate clusters within their home cluster or the next nearest cluster if no space is available within their home cluster;
4. change the type or level of class at a particular school to match more closely the number of students of a particular type and level in the cluster;
5. identify schools with additional space and reassign students accordingly.

The Board has said that it plans to refine this pattern of assignments as more information becomes available. The Board also plans to make additional revisions as it determines the space needs for assignment of Title I teachers next year.

The Board has said that it does not know how many special education students will be affected by reassignments next year. This will depend on the total number of students who are presently assigned to schools outside of their home cluster. The Board has said it should have an idea as to the number who will be reassigned by mid-April.

TRANSPORTATION

As of April 6, 1981, the Board reported that it was using 190 buses to transport 13,260 students, of whom approximately 67% are black and 33% are white. Since our January, 1981 report which noted that approximately one out of every five schools was experiencing problems with consistently delayed buses, we have noticed a significant decrease in schools reporting transportation problems. Over the last two and one-half months, 719 more route changes have been made to accommodate additional students, move pickup points, or to consolidate routes.

In all, we have received 11 complaints from schools which reported late buses. Two of these schools reported that delays occurred only occasionally. One administrator said that the delays at her school were corrected soon after she reported them to us. Sherman and Banneker Schools reported that they were having problems with the late arrival of special education buses, and Mitchell reported that the cabs transporting special education students were still consistently late.

In our November 18, 1980 report, we noted that some middle schools which qualified for after-school activity buses were not receiving these services. The Board reports that a total of 39 buses are now assigned to nine high schools and 13 middle schools, to pick up students who participate in after-school extracurricular activities.

There are currently 61 students who are transported to school by taxicab. These include 23 students from county school districts, 36 special education students, and two students attending magnet schools. Since the beginning of the year, the Transportation Division has placed 239 taxied students on regular bus routes by repairing or revising existing routes or adding new routes. In all, the Transportation Division has reduced the total number of students who are transported by cab from 300 to 61.

However, we do note that there are a few remaining problems with transportation.

In our January 19, 1981, Court report, we reported a lack of special transportation provisions for those students who are eligible for the breakfast program. Some students consistently arrive 30 to 45 minutes after breakfast has been served.

The Board investigated this problem to determine its extent but decided to make no adjustments in transporting these students. We have since learned that all but 17 schools have the breakfast program. Several principals have said that if the starting times of all schools were moved up by 15 minutes (e.g., 7:30 to 7:45 a.m.), this problem would be largely eliminated. Presently, principals allow students to eat their breakfast before going to classes. Some principals reported that they have scheduled 15 minutes of "free time" at the beginning of the day for students who do not participate in the breakfast program so all students may start their lessons at the same time.

We have received several reports from one integrated high school that the early pickup time of extracurricular buses does not accommodate students returning home from baseball games and track meets. The last pickup time of after school buses is scheduled for 5:30 p.m., although several extracurricular activities do not end until later. Only those students who live within walking distance of the school or have their own transportation home can participate in these late activities. The Principal of Soldan High School has said that the lack of afterhours transportation has caused those white students who would usually participate in activities ending after 5:30 p.m. to withdraw from them. As a result, some extracurricular events have become increasingly segregated. The Board recognizes this problem, but has said that their present contract with M and K and Gateway Bus Lines for afterhours transportation specifies a last pickup time of 5:30 p.m. Since this contract is renewable on an annual basis and because the Board appropriated only enough funds to provide coverage for the extracurricular buses which are currently used, this situation cannot be remedied until next year.

On February 27, 1981, the Board was forced to lay off 44 bus monitors due to lack of any more funds. The Board has said that it appropriated enough funds from the Desegregation Budget to hire 180 full-time monitors for the 1980-81 school year. The Board hired 157 full-time monitors and hired an additional 66 monitors on an hourly wage basis. Their purpose in hiring extra temporary monitors was twofold:

1. They could hire more monitors on an hourly basis than they could on a full-time basis. Therefore, it seemed to make better fiscal sense to hire additional monitors on an hourly wage basis than to hire only 180 full-time employees.
2. By hiring extra monitors, the Board had a backup staff in case one of the regular monitors should call in sick or not show up for work.

The Board has said that it miscalculated the number of temporary monitors they could hire with appropriated funds. They have been able to rehire ten full-time monitors, but approximately 16 buses are not provided with monitors. The Board is assigning monitors on a priority basis to buses which have been identified as "trouble" buses and all high school buses.

SECURITY

We have received few reports of security problems during the past two months. There have been some isolated incidents, some with a few racial overtones, at Long Middle School and Soldan High School. These problems seem to have been remedied by appropriate administrative action at Long and by reinforcement of security, administrative action, and discussion between the conflicting groups at Soldan.

We have also received some reports that students and visitors at Cleveland High School were not checked for identification and that there were conditions which posed potential fire hazards in the

building. We have been told by the Board that these problems have now been remedied.

TEACHER ASSIGNMENTS

Certificated Staff

The Board reports teacher shortages at 22 schools, nine high schools, six middle schools, five elementary schools and O'Fallon Vocational and Pruitt Alternative Schools.

We have received reports from 23 schools indicating staff shortages. However, two principals reported that their teacher shortages were not due to an inadequate number of teachers at their school, but rather a lack of teachers who were certificated to teach the subjects to which they were assigned. This problem seemed especially pronouced at the high school level. We received reports from Cleveland, Southwest and the Business,Management and Finance Center that as many as three of their courses were taught by teachers who did not have proper certification.

We observed several openings for Title I teachers at the high school level. Sumner, Central, Southwest, Cleveland, Roosevelt, Beaumont and McKinley reported that they lacked Title I teachers.

Most of the 23 schools reporting shortages said that openings had been temporarily filled by substitutes, some of whom were not certified to teach the subjects to which they were assigned.

The Board reports that 26 schools are presently out-of-compliance with the "Singleton Plan" for assigning certificated staff. Under provisions of the Singleton Plan, the Board was to assign staff so that the ratio of black to white certificated and noncertificated staff in each school was "substantially the same" as that of the ratio of certificated and noncertificated staff in the entire school system. For purposes of the Singleton provision, "substantially the same" means plus or minus five percentage points of the respective ratio in the entire school system or two individuals, whichever is more. The

Board has said that if the present allowance of 5% ± 2 personnel were replaced with a variance of 10%, only nine schools would remain out-of-compliance. The present requirements of the Singleton Plan have, according to the Board, caused serious problems in finding adequate numbers of personnel. Our observations of schools which lack properly certified teachers seems to substantiate the Board's contention.

NON-CERTIFICATED STAFF

The Board reports that four schools, O'Fallon, Central, Cleveland and McKinley High Schools, have non-certificated staff openings. We have received reports that Scullin and Mitchell Branch Schools are lacking teacher's aides for their Title I classes, and Hamilton and Marshall Schools are lacking enrichment lab aides.

The Board reports that nine schools are currently out-of-compliance with Singleton requirements but if a variance of 10% ± 2 were applied, only five schools would not fall within the new guidelines.

CURRICULAR DEVELOPMENT

Middle Schools

The Board has recently completed a detailed assessment of the problems and needs of middle schools in their second Middle School Progress Report. The information in this report was based on several sources of data, including public school records, questionnaires administered to middle school administrators, teachers, and students and interviews with middle school personnel. The Board has said that the report and recommendations based on its findings will help in implementing specific plans for middle school curricular development.

The report documents the most immediate and pressing problems and needs, as identified by middle school administrators and teachers:

1. Continuing construction within the buildings.

2. Bus schedules.

3. Staffing problems; greater communication and togetherness among staff members; need for specific personnel, i.e. full-time counselors, art, music, physical education, industrial arts, and home economics teachers.

4. Lack of space for some classes; physical space adjustments for special programs.

5. Over enrollment; reduced pupil/teacher ratio.

6. Supplies - greater resources - simplified procedures for obtaining supplies.

7. A consistent discipline policy at each school with strong intra-building communication.

8. More parent and community involvement.

9. A program to develop higher self-concept and better interpersonal relations among middle school students.

The report also lists the concerns of consultants who conducted on-site visits to every middle school:

1. Shortage of classrooms, as a result of the conversion from elementary to middle school buildings.

2. Incomplete facilities or need for further construction.

3. Staff shortages.

4. Disparity of equipment and materials among schools.

5. Bus schedules.

Based on their findings, the Board has made several recommendations to be considered in implementing curricular plans.

In our interviews with middle school principals, we learned that few knew of the Board's specific plans for developing middle school curriculum. Four principals said that they were aware of some of the plans being developed by the Middle School Coordinating Group which develops, coordinates and monitors middle school curriculum. However, two of these principals were aware because they were members of the Coordinating Group. One of these principals said that as a participant, he had observed that the Coordinating Group was not effective in

communicating and conveying its plans to principals and teachers who were not members. We were told by most middle school principals that curriculum planning is done on an area basis. Few principals knew whether plans for curricular developments other than implementation of home economics, industrial arts, science labs, and the creation of libraries were consistent among the three areas.

Some middle school principals said that although the middle school concept had been presented to them through several workshops and meetings, they had received few specifics on how to implement the concept and had problems with scheduling. Several principals and teachers said that since they have become more well acquainted with the middle school concept, they now need on-site, inservice training to help them implement and carry out the specific details of the middle school component.

Elementary and High Schools

At the elementary level, principals usually reported that they were working with the Area Office in revising the language arts curriculum. High school principals did not report consistently on working on any particular aspect of curricular development. However, all reported that they maintained close contact with the Area Office in planning curriculum.

TITLE I

We have observed during our visits to schools that implementation of the Title I programs has been delayed by lack of teachers in at least four schools. Title I programs at Hickey, Cole, Cote Brilliante, Emerson, Mark Twain Branch, Northwest, Walnut Park, Walnut Park Branch, Williams, Nottingham, Woodward, Hempstead, Irving, Mitchell Branch, Blow, and Mullanphy are held in combined classrooms or small offices. We also have received some reports that the aides assigned to the

Title I classes are sometimes pulled out of the classroom to perform other tasks around the school.

BUILDING RENOVATIONS

The status of implementation of home economics and industrial arts classes and the science labs in middle schools, as reported to us by principals last week, is shown in the following charts.

Principals of three of the schools which needed major renovations, Montessori, Business, Management and Finance Center and the Classical Junior Academy, reported that the renovations which were supposed to be completed at their schools in January are still ongoing.

We have learned that renovations at the Montessori School should be finished by the end of the school year. It has been estimated that renovations at the Business, Management and Finance Center may take two to three years to complete although the major contract for this year is now almost completed. Renovations at the Classical Junior Academy are progressing well, but an estimated date of completion could not be given.

CHART K

BUILDING RENOVATIONS

Home Economics

Status	School
Renovations completed, or nearly completed. All or most equipment obtained. Students working in lab.	Blewett, Blow, Clinton, Columbia, Fanning, Ford, Grant, L'Ouverture, Mullanphy, Nottingham, Simmons, Stevens, Stowe, Turner, Washington, Yeatman
Renovations nearly finished. Lacking some equipment. Limited activities held in lab.	Cook, Dewey, Hickey, King
Renovations completed. Lacking much equipment. Students working in textbooks only.	Langston, Long, Williams
Renovations incomplete. Students working in textbooks only.	Webster

CHART L

BUILDING RENOVATIONS

Industrial Arts

Status	School
Renovations completed, or nearly completed. All or most equipment obtained. Students working in lab.	Blewett, Blow, Clinton, Columbia, Fanning, King, Long, L'Ouverture, Mullanphy, Nottingham, Simmons, Stevens, Washington
Renovations nearly finished. Lacking some equipment. Limited activities held in lab.	Ford, Hickey, Yeatman
Renovations completed. Lacking much equipment. Students working in textbooks only.	Cook, Dewey, Langston, Stowe, Turner, Williams
Renovations incomplete. Lacking some equipment. Students working in textbooks only.	Webster
Renovations complete. Daily substitutes "teach" class. Lab not used.	Grant

CHART M

BUILDING RENOVATIONS

Science Labs

Status	School
Renovations completed, or nearly completed. All or most equipment obtained. Students working in lab.	Blow, Clinton, L'Ouverture, Nottingham, Simmons, Stowe, Turner, Washington
Renovations incomplete. Lacking some equipment. Students working in lab; limited activities are held in lab.	Blewett, Hickey, King
Renovations completed, or nearly completed. Lacking much equipment. Students working textbooks only.	Cook, Columbia, Dewey, Stevens, Williams
Renovations incomplete. Lab not operational. Students working in textbooks only.	Ford, Langston, Long, Webster, Yeatman
Science lab has daily substitutes "teach" class. Lab not used.	Grant
Renovations completed. Most equipment obtained. Lab not used yet.	Mullanphy

TEXTBOOKS AND SUPPLIES

We have received reports from 26 schools that they are still lacking various textbooks, supplies and equipment. We forwarded these reports to the Board. The Board has responded that nine situations of shortages have now been remedied. The warehouse has received orders from eight schools but cannot readily provide these materials either because the warehouse cannot keep up with heavy demand for certain items or because the massive transfer of texts between schools this year created a backlog of orders. In several cases, the Board indicated that the shortages reported were of supplementary materials which should be purchased from discretionary funds given to teachers. The Board said that it could not verify the shortage in five cases. In one case, the equipment was available, but the Board did not want to deliver it due to the lack of a qualified instructor who could supervise its installation and subsequent use.

MAGNET SCHOOLS

Waiting List as of March 6, 1981

SCHOOL	GRADE	BLACK	WHITE
Center for Business Management & Finance	9	119	0
	10	48	0
	11	33	0
	12	0	0
	TOTAL	200	0
Academy of Math & Science	9	170	0
	10	82	0
	11	37	0
	12	0	0
	TOTAL	289	0
Visual & Performing Arts High	9	149	17
	10	68	0
	11	60	0
	12	0	0
	TOTAL	277	17
Health Careers High	10	9	0
	TOTAL	9	0
Academic & Athletic Academy	6	39	0
	7	17	0
	8	31	0
	TOTAL	87	0
Ames Center for Expressive and Receptive Arts	Kg.	0	0
	1	7	0
	2	60	0
	3	72	0
	4	45	0
	5	82	0
	6	86	0
	7	64	0
	8	45	0
	TOTAL	461	0
Montessori	Kg.	24	2
	1	50	0
	2	39	0
	3	35	0
	TOTAL	148	2
Madison Action Learning Center	Kg.	3	0
	1	57	0
	2	41	0
	3	16	1
	4	37	0
	5	69	0
	6	59	0
	7	51	0
	8	55	0
	TOTAL	388	1

SCHOOL	GRADE	BLACK	WHITE
Visual & Performing Arts Center	Kg.	8	1
	1	91	0
	2	95	2
	3	87	7
	4	109	1
	5	72	0
	6	128	5
	7	131	1
	8	138	5
	TOTAL	859	22
Stix Investigative Learning Center	1	152	1
	2	125	1
	3	118	0
	4	152	2
	5	121	1
	6	126	3
	7	141	0
	8	123	0
	TOTAL	1,058	8
Mallinckrodt Academy of Basic Instruction	1	40	0
	2	46	1
	3	46	3
	4	56	0
	5	58	0
	6	53	0
	7	39	0
	8	37	2
	TOTAL	375	6
Waring Academy of Basic Instruction	1	68	0
	2	77	0
	3	78	0
	4	65	0
	5	78	0
	6	77	0
	7	65	0
	8	50	0
	TOTAL	558	0
Wade Individually Guided Instruction	Kg.	5	1
	1	96	1
	2	94	2
	3	99	5
	4	97	1
	5	91	0
	6	91	0
	7	91	2
	8	90	0
	TOTAL	754	12

SCHOOL	GRADE	BLACK	WHITE
Wilkinson Foreign	1	40	0
	2	35	1
	3	41	2
	4	33	1
	5	9	0
	6	26	0
	7	31	0
	8	27	0
	TOTAL	242	4

The following is the waiting list of February 14, 1981, for Magnet High Schools. These are the figures, by grade level, of the totals found in column five of Chart E.

SCHOOL	GRADE	BLACK	WHITE
Business, Management and Finance	9	94	0
	10	37	0
	11	32	0
	12	0	0
	TOTAL	163	0
Health Careers High School	10	9	0
	TOTAL	9	0
Academy of Math and Science	9	170	0
	10	82	0
	11	37	0
	12	0	0
	TOTAL	289	0
Visual and Performing Arts High School	9	149	17
	10	68	0
	11	60	0
	12	0	0
	TOTAL	277	17

APPENDIX B

Price Waterhouse & Co.

ONE MEMORIAL DRIVE
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI 63102
314-425-0500

March 4, 1981

Mr. Edward T. Foote, Chairman
Desegregation Monitoring and
Advisory Committee
522 Olive, 2nd Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63101

Dear Mr. Foote:

As requested, we have reviewed and performed certain tests of procedures designed by the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis to compile and maintain enrollment rosters for elementary and secondary school students in the St. Louis public schools. Our work included the following:

1. we reviewed the procedures to compile and maintain enrollment rosters as set forth in the "1980-1981 Elementary Student Accounting System User's Manual" and the "1980-1981 Secondary Accounting System User's Manual" compiled by the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis;

2. we had discussions with certain employees of the Board of Education in order to supplement information contained in the user's manuals described above;

3. we reviewed selected elementary school student roster reports prepared as of January 2, 1981 and February 3, 1981 and, by utilizing the related maintenance transaction lists and maintenance error reports for the period January 3, 1981 through February 3, 1981, reconciled the number of students on the selected January 2, 1981 elementary school student roster reports to the number of students on the selected February 3, 1981 elementary school student roster reports;

4. we compared the data appearing on selected elementary enrollment information forms prepared at the schools with the appropriate maintenance transaction lists and maintenance error reports and found them to be in agreement;

5. we reviewed selected secondary school student master lists prepared as of January 30, 1981 and February 6, 1981 and, by utilizing the related secondary school student data forms prepared at the schools, pending enrollment lists and student number list addenda, reconciled the number of students on the selected January 30, 1981 secondary school student master lists to the number of students on the selected February 6, 1981 secondary school student master lists; and

6. we performed limited testing of the arithmetical accuracy of the number of students as recorded on the enrollment rosters for selected schools and found no exceptions.

Our work was not directed primarily toward obtaining knowledge of specific compliance or noncompliance with the procedures purported to be in effect and, accordingly, we express no opinion as to such compliance or noncompliance. In addition, we did not perform a physical count of students at any schools and, accordingly, we express no opinion as to the accuracy of the student roster reports referred to previously.

In our opinion, the procedures, as set forth in the manuals described in 1. above and as described to us by certain employees of the Board of Education, which are designed to compile elementary and secondary school enrollment rosters for the St. Louis public schools for the 1980-1981 school year, if properly followed, are adequate for the purpose of maintaining reasonably accurate student enrollment data.

This report is intended for the information and use of the Desegregation Monitoring and Advisory Committee and should not be used for any other purpose.

Yours very truly,

Price Waterhouse & Co.

Price Waterhouse & Co.

ONE MEMORIAL DRIVE
ST. LOUIS MISSOURI 63102
314 425-0500

March 19, 1981

Mr. Edward T. Foote, Chairman
Desegregation Monitoring and
Advisory Committee
522 Olive, 2nd Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63101

Dear Mr. Foote:

As requested, set forth below is a brief outline of the steps that would be required, and the audit procedures that we would perform, to enable us to express an opinion on the accuracy, within a given degree of precision and confidence level, of the number of students appearing on rosters for elementary and secondary school students in the St. Louis public schools as of a specified date.

First, it would be necessary that the Board of Education update its rosters as of the specified date. This would require that all schools provide the general office with the required student transaction documents through that specified date and that the rosters be updated immediately. Delays in this process could significantly add to the amount of follow-up work required by us in instances where a student selected for testing had transferred, or some other student transaction had occurred, between the specified date and the dates of our visits to the schools.

Our testing would be based upon sophisticated statistical sampling techniques and would include the following:-

1. Through discussions with you and St. Louis Board of Education employees, and limited judgmental testing, the following parameters would be determined:

- The size of the population - the number of students on the primary and secondary school rosters,
- The conservative error rate expected - the expected percentage of errors in the rosters,
- The maximum tolerable error rate - the rate of error above which you would not consider the rosters to be sufficiently accurate, and
- The confidence level - the degree of risk that the sample taken is or is not truly representative of the entire population.

2. Based upon the above parameters determined, and through the use of our statistical sampling computer timesharing programs, we would calculate the required number of students to be tested. The attached Exhibit I sets forth the number of students which would have to be randomly selected and tested under various combinations of parameters and assuming that the rosters contain approximately 43,000 elementary students and 20,000 secondary students.

3. Our representatives would visit the schools and, where possible, physically identify the students selected. The testing of our random selection probably would require our visiting almost every one of the over 120 schools. If the student was not present on the day we were at the school, we would attempt to ascertain if he or she was a bonafide student as of the date of the roster, through discussions with school administrators and/or students, review of office records or other means.

4. The results of our identification test will be statistically evaluated by use of our computer timesharing programs. Exhibit I indicates the number of errors beyond which we would consider the rosters to contain greater than the maximum tolerable error rate established by you.

The procedures outlined above encompass the [illegible]ty but not necessarily all of the procedures that would be necessary in order to report to you on the accuracy of the number of students as shown on the rosters. It is difficult to estimate the time required to perform an engagement of this nature, particularly time required to

follow-up discrepancies encountered in the identification test. However, we believe that our fee for this engagement would be in the range of $16,000 to $20,000.

Yours very truly,

Price Waterhouse & Co.

Attachment

EXHIBIT I

EXAMPLE OF REQUIRED SAMPLE SIZE GIVEN VARIOUS PARAMETERS AND MAXIMUM SAMPLE ERROR RATE

	Primary Schools[1]				Secondary Schools[2]			
Error rate expected	2%	3%	3%	4%	2%	3%	3%	4%
Maximum tolerable error rate (MTER)	5%	5%	10%	10%	5%	5%	10%	10%
Confidence level	95%	95%	90%	90%	95%	95%	90%	90%
Sample size	181	360	52	65	180	360	52	65
Results are unacceptable (roster error rate is estimated to be in excess of MTER) if more than the following number of errors are found	4	11	2	3	4	11	2	3

(1) Assumes 43,000 students on roster
(2) Assumes 20,000 students on roster